

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
Marine Reserves Working Group**

May 16, 2001
8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Chase Palm Park Building
Santa Barbara, California

MEETING SUMMARY

In Attendance:

Mike Eng – Facilitator
John Jostes - Facilitator
Patty Wolf - Chair
Matt Pickett – Co-Chair
Steve Roberson
Deborah McArdle
Locky Brown
Gary Davis
Greg Helms
Mark Helvey
Dr. Craig Fusaro
Marla Daily
Bob Fletcher
Shawn Kelly
Dale Glantz

Sanctuary Staff – Sean Hastings, Satie Airame

Audience – 50+

INTRODUCTIONS

Patty - Today is the day to come to consensus, extra effort in the last two weeks was needed and is appreciated. At the last Fish and Game Commission (FGC) meeting Commissioner Mike Chrisman thanked the MRWG for its hard work, he said that it is appreciated, especially the commitment of everyone to work together. He also said that the process is in the spotlight to see how well consensus works for future resource management processes, and he encouraged the MRWG to work hard toward common ground.

Mike Weber, FGC consultant - Spoke with Fish and Game Commissioner Mike Chrisman as well, and reiterates the Commission's appreciation of the MRWG good will. The Commission would like to see a consensus decision. This process and decision will have implications for future decision-making, without consensus, a decision will be made, they will review the final outcome of today, but it is difficult to predict. Commissioner Chrisman wished the group the best of luck in the negotiation.

Matt Pickett – There is a small window this morning to reach consensus on a map. It is very important this model process be a success, consensus would add to the success. He would like to use this consensus in the future, without consensus we follow the groundrules to forward areas of agreement and disagreement to the SAC.

Round table introductions for MRWG members and the public.

John Jostes –mentioned that MRWG is short of a consensus map, even though there was hard work in the last three weeks. He offered an overview on how to proceed. The public is encouraged to make comments directly to representatives at the table. As facilitators we don't expect consensus at any cost, but to help the group understand the issues, relationships, document added value of going through this process.

Review agenda – six options and steps

1. Single map to negotiate
2. Groundrules to agree or determine impasse
3. Something less than five islands agreement
4. Punt spatial / map component
5. Decide what to forward to the SAC
6. Written recommendation – components to review and forward, how to involve technical panels, meet before SAC as a group

Michael Eng – Dozens of proposals have been developed.

Greg Helms– we are close to bringing together a map that works for fishermen and the environment. It is challenging to decide where to begin. I would like to begin with something we have seen and that has been analyzed. We should have something that is close to where we ended up last meeting. The map closest to Map I, is Map E, which is a modified version of Map C. Map E was ecologically short, and more importantly needed economic work. This would be an efficient place to start.

Chris – can Satie bring up various maps for reference?

The group view maps C and E and Chris points out the commercial fishing focus of these maps.

Tom– we spent a lot of time last meeting moving from map E that I have issues with, let's start with map I.

Greg – Tom and Chris are right. I have a handout that has maps I and E and the socio-economic analysis. E attempts to minimize socio-economic impacts. He reviews how modifications address different fishing issues (halibut, white sea bass drifts) trying to reflect its balance so that everyone is equally unhappy.

Satie has projected Map E and I on to the screen.

Greg – Think openly, use the groundrules to identify areas of agreement and disagreement.

Tom – Lets start with Map I, Map E and the differences are considerable, very different then where we ended up, this is starting all over again and I would throw in things that I gave up last time.

Craig – with both on the screen we have the start and end of the spectrum, I think we can work from this, everybody's stuff is up there.

Chris – every mapping process has ignored the hook and line and trawlers in federal waters, everyone has categorically ignored our concerns.

Bob- Concept I didn't have an East end Santa Cruz Island area, it went out to 15 fathoms.

Satie – there was not agreement on either map, so both are up there.

Jostes – we heard concerns that map I was not enough. It reflects the overlap, but not enough good quality habitats in the eyes of some. I hear Bob and Tom say this doesn't work for them.

Tom – We ended with map I, and I don't think I stand alone on this. I don't want to have to fight these battles again.

Steve –you put areas up that were agreeable to us. Concept E is what our constituents wanted.

Tom- let us debate these areas on a reserve by reserve basis.

Craig – so you want to start with map I?

Marla – I agree with Tom, it is difficult for me to bring it all together.

Greg – Map E is something that was developed collaboratively. Map I does not work ecologically and is deficient, map E is our comfort zone, Map I is...

Bob - This is a political process, you are trying to couch this discussion. I am more interested in the socio-economic goals, and this is unacceptable burden, the technical panels all provide us advice, we are not going to go where you want to go, the reality is you have to live with what we will give up. Put aside the scientific approaches, we will never get to map E, given where my industry is today.

Greg- I am making a step toward you, I think we need to use the scientific advice.

Steve – Map I is the lowest common denominator, so lets see where we end up.

Deborah – To clarify something with what Bob said, map E is significantly less than the science panel's recommendation, so we have made a step.

Shawn – Map E is not only Greg's map, it involves a wide array of this group and was an honest effort.

Michael Eng – Do maps E and I represent the bookends? If so, then we see where the differences lie so that you can and explore ways to bridge the differences. So improve map I and decrease map E?

Patty – Recall that this is a place to start, this allows us to get all of our ideas on the table.

Jostes – So can we start with map I?

Matt – we started with map E because it is easier to shave politically for the consumptive users.

Satie – I will organize screen to view both maps E and I.

Jostes – what is it about map E that you can't live with?

Dale – No concern, my comment is we have fought some battles already, and we don't have time for more.

Neil – There is a problem with the front side of Anacapa and Santa Barbara Island, I prefer a "pie shape" reserve.

Craig – For Santa Barbara Island, given the bird issues, the North side is what is needed.

Harry Liquornik – We have already gone through the west, we need to look at ANI, SBI, otherwise we have the whole mess to deal with.

Locky – we reached an agreement of sort on the west, which is not being upheld, ANI and SBI is not acceptable.

Bob – Ditto, let's start where we left off, there are problems with SCI and ANI and SBI.

Michael Eng– can we focus on areas where there are differences?

Tom – We will end up repeating what has been said. There is disagreement on where we reached agreement on the last meeting.

Mark – we left with question marks on three of the Islands.

GROUP focuses on East Santa Cruz Island

Tom – East SCI, leave open to all recreation, squid and lobster. Go from Cavern Pt. to Coches as a reserve.

Marla – How about a 15 fathom area near Scorpion?

Tom – How deep do the divers need?

Greg – That's excellent, thanks for offering an alternative.

Neil – I can't give that.

The MRWG breaks for a caucus with constituents.

Neil – I would consider 20 fathoms on the west-end closure of Scorpion.

Locky – That would impact divers, Cavern Pt. is essential.

Chris – This will not meet the socio-economic goal, essential for lobster guys from the regional ports. Early season lobsters are close to the beach, and there are differences in harvest between the north side and south side of Santa Cruz Island.

Greg – Can you offer a counter proposal?

Gary – Non-consumptive divers can only get to Scorpion and Anacapa Island (ANI). How about designating the west side of the proposed Scorpion closure as a conservation area and the east side of Scorpion as no take.

Bob – This creates a problem, I have suggested the opposite, and 15 fathoms is pushing it. All the fish live between 15 and 20 fathoms like white sea bass. Three quarter day boats come from Pt. Hueneme and need the East Santa Cruz Island (SCI).

Chris – The East SCI proposal illustrates the issues of congestion and overlap of uses. You have to evaluate using no-take reserves in the context of existing fishing regulations. We should consider complete no takes and conservation areas here. No-take adds congestion and diminishes what we are trying to achieve. The proposed Footprint closure is a large stock re-building reserve. No-takes are not to be used as a supplement to fishery management.

Steve – Consider East side of Scorpion out to 15 fathoms as closed, and west side of Scorpion to allow lobster only out to 15 fathoms.

Chris – There is no biological production beyond one mile, and this outside area is vital to a seabass drift.

Greg – The North side of SCI is biologically important, and we are unlikely to find and agree on a closure anywhere else around SCI, ANI, (Santa Rosa Island) SRI. I understand the extra half hour of driving time for charter boat fishing, but we need to think about access issues for all visitors, such as the educational groups that visit the Scorpion area.

Steve – I also understand the charter industry needs time to get to these areas.

Tom – This area is important to the average recreational angler, the proposal shuts this access down to the public user.

Greg – It is only a fraction of SCI and there is not a proposed no-take area in 40 miles of the mainland.

Patty – Somewhere we need deepwater habitat on the North side of the Islands.

Greg – Exactly, that is all we ask.

Gary – I agree, we keep referring to San Pedro Pt., I think this is the most practical point.

Jostes – what is the proposal?

Steve – too many exceptions for different uses makes it not worth it.

Michael – I hear the sport issue is the travel distance, consider the whole benefits and future added benefits to everyone at the table. Travel time is not closing it off.

Bob – There are more productive fishing grounds on the eastern half than the western half, this plus the travel time.

Tom – The East side is in the lee and it is a safety issue.

Marla – This proposal will not fly. Consider keeping no take out to 15 fathoms at Scorpion only. Or out to San Pedro Pt.

Deborah – we should stay focussed on no-take, and if DFG wants to create conservation areas that is there prerogative.

Steve - I am not okay with this proposal. Let's add more conservation area to it.

Chris – the target is nearshore rockfish, without impacting lobster and squid.

Deborah – Haven't we learned from the 104 small reserves up and down the State? By allowing different uses we compromise the integrity of the protected area.

Greg – I don't think what is being suggested is fair, the goals and objectives are comprised, the majority of us were in agreement, and most of us had supported a small no-take on the west side, what we are widdled down is unacceptable.

Shawn - Bob made a concession on the West, that didn't work for Chris, and we have digressed, and with transit as the only issue I can not say the process has been fair.

John – Caucus and focus on what you can support and forward. Do we want to settle on something less? Shall we forward a recommendation that covers less than the five Islands?

Mark – Islands or bio-regions? Look at the Footprint, what Island is that part of, I'm thinking of coverage in all three bio-regions.

Tom – we spent 2 years on areas for no-take, we have set aside 140,000 acres, and it would be a shame to lose that effort.

Bob – I tend to agree, given the MLPA is coming forward and we may take our chance with MLPA. It is significant what we have agreed on and this should go forward, this shouldn't be wasted just because we didn't reach a minimum level.

Shawn – We ended up with Map I, with lots of progress on western Islands, some consensus, there are fundamental problems in reaching consensus on eastern island, one map that is color coded, one shade for areas of agreement, and shade areas for areas that we feel are missing. Each group could illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of these areas.

Jostes – Would we all agree to disagree on the non-consensus areas?

Michael – This may be inconsistent with the groundrules.

Locky – We should offer something up given our hard work. It's important we make an offering of some sort, I am concerned that we are talking past each other. There is a lack of communication, I'm not sure we are that far away from consensus, unfortunately we haven't made it.

Chris –No comment, I thought we are talking about the map, I will have to pass for now.

Marla – put forward where we have reached consensus, disclosure we didn't have adequate time and meetings, we haven't talked about ANI and SBI, I am opposed to say we failed, rather this is as far as we got given the time we were allocated.

Craig – Yes, for forwarding less than five islands.

Patty – Yes, we haven't time to tackle ANI and SBI, but I believe consensus would allude us anyway on those Islands.

Greg – I don't want to go against the small SCI and I don't want to say Map I is good when it is the lowest common denominator. If that is all we can produce, I would like to see these areas protected, but more area is needed and 90% of the group supported more. We want reserves that work for fishermen and the environment. We are not considering the highly valuable areas. Should we agree on less than five Islands? We should focus on ANI and SBI until lunch and we owe it to ourselves to do so.

Chris – I'm in line with Marla, Craig and Patty, look at Islands we can agree on, I've been saying it for six meetings about San Miguel Island (SMI) and SCI offshore areas, but the offshore guys will go to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Inside three miles of SMI and one mile of SCI. The whole issue is a forced timeline and we do have until the August FGC meeting and we can come with a map for the three northern islands so we can address the FGC.

Bob – PFMC process allows a natural phase in for federal waters and FMP amendments.

Steve – finish with ANI and SBI and get a map that has only no-take zones, with a caveat that the MLPA and FGC can add areas and I will argue for more, and I will take what I can get now and continue my efforts elsewhere. I won't say that I am happy with what is proposed, I will forward the lowest common denominator because protection now is better than protection later. I will accept what I can get, but I will fight for more later.

Michael – This is short of full agreement, anyone can lobby later, agreement and disagreement will be forwarded.

Deborah – I thought when we started we were going to look at the whole region because we understand connections between the Islands. The vision from Science Panel has directed us to see these connections. The map up there doesn't consider connectivity, only where people fish and don't fish. I could go with three Islands, but we would have to recognize the need for deep-water habitat.

Neil – beauty is in the eye in the beholder, what is up there looks good to me, lots of reef and canyon. 2 years ago this was impossible to accept, 45 yrs ago I could fish anywhere, many fisheries are healthy, and I am giving up areas, so I think we have come a long way. I will forward the three Islands, but we should look at the two other islands. Now we have given up as much as we can economically, maybe we can revisit the issue in five years.

Dale – we have come along way, I didn't think we could get all Islands, will the FGC wait for us to consider more? I can support less than five Islands.

Gary – We have an unqualified consensus on the goals and objectives, and we have come along way, but it is real hard to know what we achieved. I recommend we provide the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) a progress report of where we are today. Consensus is not all that satisfying, it is the goals and objectives that are satisfying.

Patty - not much room to work up to August, there are procedural steps, anyone is welcome to keep mapping, if the FGC chooses the MLPA process it is well laid out how that proceeds.

Matt – more time will not bring together the political divide. We should refer to the groundrules. This is an advisory body to an advisory body to Patty and I who will provide a recommendation to the decision makers. We have looked at ANI and SBI that have been fully ecologically and economically analyzed, we can not reach consensus because of political differences. Maps E and I accurately represent where we are and they need to be cleaned up – this does represent our two years of work. Forward this to the SAC and what is behind these maps.

Craig – forwarding Maps E and I is not congruent with our groundrules based on areas of agreement and disagreement.

Jostes- Reviews areas of agreement (goals and objectives, problem statement, etc). What is left to agree on is some of the language to forward to the SAC, or does the group want to put effort on further refining the map? You could see if the original map I is as far as you could get, or focus on ANI and SBI to strive for the conditions Deborah just described to achieve a network.

Patty – I understand the interest in focussing on ANI and SBI. Are we satisfied with what we have done on the other three islands? Prefer to focus on SMI, SCI and SRI.

Chris – I agree with Patty, I have pointed out the idea of this area as a bio-region is bogus. We never bought into it. I suggest refining SMI, SRI and SCI, and not the arbitrary lines and recognize the water shift over the Islands, we have potential for a very valuable up current reserve. I understand that it is not good enough, but nor is the gerrymandering of the currents without real data. MLPA will put reserves on the coast. We have to have some faith on the adaptive process and fishery management.

Greg – the fairest information to forward to the SAC and community are the areas of concern that each group wants.

Steve – We could put together a single map of E and I.

Craig – I want to transmit clarity to the SAC, and we have trouble with this overlay, so we need to agree on where we disagree, and disagreement on areas is confusing.

Jostes – Provides a review what came out of last map I.

Greg – Drop the prawn trap exclusion area, this is not common ground.

Tom – There are areas of importance to certain fisheries and reserve areas that sport-fishermen can live with. As we get to the East it becomes very important to sport-

fishermen and we will need to have some sport-fishermen only. When we refer to this as a lowest common denominators, it is really common denominator. Can we get offset in the entire picture? we will be looking for in the eastern island, and we need offsets in SBI. We have given a lot because we expect tradeoffs in areas where we have important areas.

Matt – we need to focus on the whole picture of the CINMS, Island by Island losses are the tradeoffs.

Tom - Map E is a step backward

Steve - Clarifies what the East SCI proposal protects and doesn't protect.

Neil – why are you giving up areas with some protection?

Steve – There is no agreement, I am not agreeing, I don't want the SAC to think we agree to map I.

Jostes – There are two perspectives here– map I reflects common areas but not goals and objectives, the other is that without more area this map doesn't satisfy what the group set out to do, so this isn't a sufficient marine reserve network.

Deborah – we have focussed on no-take, and we are now watering down on what we were trying to do by considering conservation areas and allowable harvest.

Satie – it would be clearer if there were areas of complete overlap.

Chris – I hear people saying send most area of agreement – and also using the goals and objectives to explain how this works and doesn't work. From my perspective we need parity of impacts and socio-economic and fishery goals and I have repeated this for six months.

Craig- can we adjust the map to reflect this?

Jostes – we are identifying common areas, and that at least these areas be set-aside.

Greg – this is deconstructing the process, I want to provide clarity to the SAC too and by doing this we are moving away from what were the common agreed to areas.

Chris – Describes what North SCI reserves protect.

Greg – I am not talking about the maps, but what to provide to the SAC.

Craig – We have already failed to create a network of reserves for CINMS, we are focussing on “where” we agree and disagree.

Shawn – This is a semantics problem with what is agreement and consensus, drop these terms, and focus on common areas.

Marla – reiterated what Craig said.

Deborah – I can understand the Map E and I overlay.

Patty – where are there other areas of agreement?

Maps are adjusted to reflect the MRWG discussion.

Matt – we are not clear on what we are doing here.

Marla – we should allow minor tweaking and consider additional areas.

Steve – what this is, is what the commercial and recreational guys can live with, if this is the case then I will forward map B along with this map.

Matt – should we continue this mapping process?

Steve – one map, one document with both ideas.

Marla – I don't understand why you can't support a common area map?

Steve – common area map could be misconstrued as what could be agreed to, and it isn't what I agree to.

LUNCH – The group breaks for lunch.

Jostes – MRWG is having difficulty defining the common ground. Map I has been modified to reflect Chris and Harry's areas, kelp and prawn harvest grounds have been left open, a reserve out to 15 fathoms at East SCI was suggested. Sending this to SAC will not paint the picture of the range of perspectives of the MWRG at this critical point. Can we get this overlap to agreement or we pair it with another map to provide a map with agreement and disagreement? Can we agree this map represents the overlap areas that would be appropriate for reserves?

Greg – Does it represent the overlap areas?

Steve – I could support sending a map that includes overlap areas with map E.

Bob – How about a subset of the MRWG put up another option. I have no problem with two options going forward, I am hesitant to have one map with overlap, because it would be confusing, we can present side by side maps and forward these two maps to the SAC.

Craig – We owe the SAC the clearest message possible, overlaying maps is not clear.

Satie – You could use hatches to demarcate areas or some other demarcation symbol to show different areas very clearly.

Jostes – Let's focus on putting forward two maps and then worry about how to present.

Greg – A question I ask myself is do we present something that is reasonable such as map E or something the environmental community prefers like map B?

Satie – Map E and the projected map are very close, can the MRWG bring them together?

MRWG – No.

Jostes – Let's focus on substantive issues. The proposal is to send forth map E and the overlap map to the SAC and highlight differences.

Chris – In sending Concept E with the overlap map we have not had an opportunity to discuss ANI and possible areas we may agree on.

Deborah – We have had many opportunities to consider these areas.

Chris – but these areas have not been evaluated and given to the full group to consider.

Deborah - go ahead and suggest areas at ANI and SBI, there will not be debate from our group.

Tom – There is no agreement on forwarding two maps.

Jostes – so the MRWG does not want to forward maps?

Chris – no.

Deborah - why can't we look at ANI?

Greg – I suggest the commercial and recreational guys suggest areas for ANI and SBI, and only these guys vote this round.

Chris – does this represent a straw poll for these areas?

Jostes walks the group through each one by one mile square area of ANI. There is no agreement or suggested closed areas by commercial or recreational interest on any square mile nearshore. A two by two square mile area on N. ANI, offshore more than one mile, is the only area suggested by consumptive interests.

Tom – if no one had any issues with map E, recreational anglers have given up 100,000 acres, and it has been a stretch for us.

Steve – new areas would include areas beyond East SRI.

Patty/Matt – Let's keep it clean with map E.

Chris – what Steve is saying is to make it clear he will take all of the areas that represent suggested areas.

Jostes- do you want to modify map E to include the overlap areas?

Steve/Deborah – Yes.

Chris – one map only with areas of disagreement too.

Tom – will this go before the MLPA, my concern is that you need to look at map E areas and consider other MPA designations. We recognizing that this process will not do this, we are close to an overall map.

Matt – are there any of the hatched areas that we can consider?

Greg/Steve – no

Bob – Greg refers to map E as a compromise, and yet the overlap area is the result of a huge amount of pressure on us, this is not where we prefer to be, and we are not comparing apples to apples – this represents as far as we can go.

Greg – agreed, this is a tragedy that we came so close but this is the compromise.

Deborah – Map E has less than representative habitat as suggested by the best available science.

Jostes – what else does the MRWG want to include in the facilitator report?

Sean – I suggest the MRWG refer to the working draft recommendation document to decide what to forward to the SAC.

The MRWG reviews this document and decides what to include and not to include and suggests edits to include in a facilitator report.

Jostes describes the contents of the Facilitator Report. What will be described includes differences in terms of the two maps, and common or consensus areas, process observations and overall benefits (working relationships, increased capacity, take away value etc.).

Other items to consider

What is the role of technical panels from here?

Regarding the presentation to the SAC – should it be the facilitators or co-chairs or both?

Can the MRWG review the facilitator's report?

Jostes – we are not characterizing this as consensus in the report, we will try and bridge process and substance issues.

Michael – we were hired to provide neutral observations, and to that end we will present a clear and objective picture of what happened in the process. As individuals the MRWG can provide individual observations as well. We will distinguish what you agreed on and our observations.

Patty – Regarding overall process observations, I am looking with Matt and the facilitators to do a formal comprehensive process evaluation to understand what we can learn from this process. The Sanctuary, DFG and FGC are interested. This would be independent review process.

Bob- I hope that map concept E does not go forward with the language on the yellow sheet Greg handed out.

Jostes – The two different proposals will not have names, or point blame.

Deborah – are we including the Science Panel and Socio-economic evaluation?

Jostes – That depends on how this is presented to the SAC. We recommend facilitators do it, but not excluding others in the presentation.

Tom – the co-chairs hosted and paid for the process, they should be given the chance to deliver the recommendation.

Jostes – we will work with the co-chairs to come up with a presentation.

Michael – there should be a fairly neutral report, remember the co-chairs are both hosts and representatives of their agencies.

Chris – facilitators are the best to present the proposed areas. The message I got from the FGC was to go back to the community where the Sanctuary program was described as a

neutral convener, with the administration changes and the executive order they became stakeholders, which caused a lot of tension in the fishing community. So the facilitators should be the ones to present.

Jostes – should the Science Panel and socio-economic panel analyze it? Given that there is no agreement?

Deborah – I would hope the Panels tell us if these maps will meet the goals, and why they don't, perhaps more of a narrative analysis that summarizes both maps.

Chris – our agreed to process and flow charts describes the recommendation as going through the MRWG so we need to be able to synthesize the final analysis and incorporate into our comments. The Science Panel recommendation has not been presented in a completed product form, but in a piece meal fragmented form. So we need that completed in order to evaluate it, signed by Science Panel, delivered to us before it goes to SAC and FGC. if we don't have time for that than it shouldn't go forward.

Greg – We have had a healthy discussion on what the Science Panel (SP) and Socio-Economic Panel (SEP) analysis mean. Note that the Socio-economic panel was unable to quantify the benefits through economics. In the context of our inability to reach agreement, how does it fit into what we are doing? I don't recall asking them for a peer reviewed product.

Chris – I have asked from day 1 for a review of the 20% original proposal. Then they dropped their recommendation on us and I have been under their gun ever since

Deborah – the SAC and FGC deserve to see an economic and ecological analysis.

Tom – What we have is a stakeholder process and the tools we have utilized have been the Panels, if there is disagreement on what to do with the SP and SEP reports and recommendations and no agreement on a map there is nothing we can send to them to evaluate.

Bob – if we had reached agreement, then it would be appropriate. But we have failed. I don't support a science panel review because I already know they will say our proposal falls short of meeting the goals.

Sean – I find it very interesting that there is fear and concern of applying science and economic review and analysis. What kind of message is this sending to the public?

Greg – I want to know what we have done. We need to clarify our answer to the SAC. We have a spatial description and I hope that the SAC wants this to be analyzed.

Deborah – if we give the SAC our goals and objectives then they should have the other components of this process too.

Tom – we need to control the process while we can, and if the SAC wants to choose to do more than they can.

Satie – The SP is responsible to the academic community and the peer review process. So at some point professionally they do have to review the maps. Because they are responsible to not only this process but to their professions.

Chris – I am uncomfortable with processes going on that we don't have the opportunity to evaluate.

Patty – I am committed to working with Matt and the facilitators to provide a process evaluation and take the lessons learned forward to future management issues.

Michael – It is time to close out the process, this was a new and different approach on a very challenging and difficult task. There is a tendency in stakeholders and consensus processes to evaluate if an agreement is reached. In the absence of an agreement there is still value in the experience and process. There is a tendency to feel disappointed if there is no agreement. Take a few moments and reflect on values, benefits and gains in this process personally, and to the larger community as a whole. Think of changes and growth individually and collectively.

MRWG - Final comments.

Tom – Looking back on the discussion we needed reserves and was it necessary, and the smaller of those today is 100,000 acres of reserves, we shouldn't lose that, stakeholders from all perspectives made an agreement to come up with a reserve network. In Florida, it took six years and we came so close and we have all invested so much its a shame we didn't forward with a single recommendation. For the future bring the charts out early to allow the contention to happen. The Sanctuary was founded 21 years ago and since then the consumptive users who got beat up in this process have invested 1 billion dollars. Marine conservation side has invested zero and we need to change that to make fisheries management side better and to recognize how much we have invested.

Bob – no way any of us could have expected the kind of education we have received, the process has forced us to see other perspectives and information, this will serve us better for the future. We are better equipped to deal with issues and our jurisdictional awareness has increased. We need a better understanding of limitations and points of views, failings and details in enforcement monitoring and evaluation. When I was first being considered I was asked did I have the time? I said I would make the time, it was something I needed to participate in even though some of you may not wish I was involved. I have more information for and from the sport fishing association, offering up significant areas – there is a lot there to benefit fisheries and habitats. It was interesting how we have picked and choose the goals and objectives – they are like the Magnuson Act. There is something for everyone to argue for and that's the way it should be – science and economics – too bad we didn't find common ground but its not a failure.

Mark – we didn't know where to start in the beginning and we have come a long way given two maps and the goals and objectives. We are not coming away with consensus, which is disappointing. One map doesn't meet the expectations of some MRWG. But it's a starting point for the MLPA and the PFMC. We talked about some different strategies like phasing MPA's, too bad they didn't flesh out. They could have helped us. With the maps they will know those of us who have given up the most economically. Take one map as a start with adaptive management and given all of the uncertainty in the theory of reserves we can start with something. We can take what we learned and apply it.

Shawn – This has been a real life case study of the tragedy of the commons, a true social dilemma, as a graduate student with a focus on marine management it is quite a supplement to that course work and has been very beneficial. The process put faces on the issues, characterizes the issues, hearing perspectives, great information was collected, effectively catalogued stakeholder concerns, sometimes quantitatively and sometimes not, not the right answer but an underlying truth. Stakeholder consensus process unreachable but worthwhile in collecting data. Remember that environmentalists don't hate fishermen.

Locky – I had no idea or preconceived notion on how it would go, as an educational procedure and contribution to working out the issues. I feel working with everyone very worthy, accomplished quite a bit and there is good information to build on. One step in forming no-take zones, it has been a very positive experience.

Chris – Given the map we have today, I see a scale of reserves network we couldn't refine the boundaries on in terms of scale of size that covered the Islands. In not resolving boundary issues, community consensus on reserves still exists, even if we had signed on to least common denominator map it would still be bigger than all that we have on the continent. Given my 25 years of experience if you didn't think it was enough you would think twice with the personal experience. Most positive for my fishery is we asked for log books from the Department and had them analyze and became more proactive. Now I'm an organizer in three Bight wide projects. Our exposure with the SE work and GIS work is thanks to the Sanctuary. We have created our own databank that also carries over to quality of the habitat. Application to the nearshore fisheries map, and sanctuary support to understand what is really going on at the Islands, a lot of stuff going forward, and we will one day have a common community understanding and be able to deal with uncertainty.

Marla – better than reality TV shows, we are all better off, no amount of consulting fees are knowledge could generate what this process has developed. We all don't have the same level of knowledge – Islands, textbook, technical, we need to spend more time on the water, spatially we are talking about a lot of area.

Craig – I endorse the direct experience with the Islands, I'll save my criticisms, thank each and every one of you, every one has persevered, there are a lot of new contacts in resource management, extractive users and environmentalist. These relationships will carry forward to course work in classes I teach at Bren (UCSB). We have amassed a

huge beneficial information base, now all in one place at the Sanctuary. This is an immense treasure and I thank the process for doing that. We have been the beta test site for community based decision-making and we tested it, consensus based negotiation for tough resource management discussions. We have made progress toward a real network of reserves, raised issues to be worked out in the future, such as integration of reserves into MLPA and MLMA, phasing of implementation, how fast to get where we wanted to go. Phasing allows integration and users to adapt, we have pointed to a large array of specific sites at the Islands and need further analysis that can be taken forward as groundwork in other processes.

Greg – This has been an excellent Channel Islands education. I remember McGinnis' speech about this being time well spent and providing guidance to decision makers. I intend to continue in marine conservation work and I will not forget as a professional conservationist the benefits of discussions, and the education from everyone. I have a deep appreciation of the Channel Islands and its values. I developed a belief in co-management, support of local markets, fishery trusts and resource trust and this will be part of my conservation work in the future. The process brought a tremendous amount of information scientifically and economically and where the holes are, the ethnographic survey is very important. We may have put more pressure on the constituents and ourselves than can be endured – it is an enormous amount of pressure that's not realistic, but the right thing to do. The FGC wanted local input and they will get it, and we will deliver goals and objectives. There are more than suggestions coming out of this process, we couldn't provide a local decision for them, but the FGC will have to make a decision based on what we have done – we have made an honorable effort to lead, and we must ask the FGC to honor that leadership. Thanks to everyone for his or her hard work.

Steve – On a personal level I met many nice people. We didn't get the job done, and so I have to continue the effort in the SAC and the FGC to satisfy the goals and objectives. Future its difficult to negotiate when everyone has a veto power, they get a lot of pressure from constituents to stop the effort, pressure should be on negotiating.

Deborah – personally I found this process to be very educational, and I am very grateful for all first hand knowledge - it equals my college experience. There is very valuable information for the future. In the past when reserves were designated goals and objectives were not defined which only leads to difficulty in assessment. I hope whoever carries this forward that they can really meet the goals and objectives, including the size and location of reserves. Australia has learned the hard way that you need all representative habitats. I hope we achieve a network that encapsulates all representative habitats.

Neil – I thank the MRWG for allowing me to represent my industry, and thank Satie, Jostes and Eng. I am very disappointed we didn't reach consensus. I have to tell my constituents that we couldn't agree with the environmentalists, and that the ocean is limited. As users we respect the need to appreciate the beauty of the Islands. They are irreplaceable. CINMS can protect these Islands. A better understanding of phasing and economic impacts are needed and I support them.

Dale – It was an outstanding learning experience on varying perspectives. Reaching consensus was always going to be difficult, no one would have walked away winners or losers, we all survived, the accident is painful but the rehabilitation is where the real difficulty is, thanks to all of you and hopefully it will pay off.

Gary –My worst fear is that we would do too little too late, and we have. Life is a journey not a destination, best part has been working with everyone, staff, group, panels. We have missed an opportunity for stewardship here, but we are still in the game. The process was very interesting and the world will evaluate us into the future.

Patty – I too am disappointed with no consensus, maybe we could have done things differently. I am not disappointed in the hard work and effort. Consensus approaches need to be reviewed. For the DFG constituent involvement is a new way of doing things and it is very challenging, and way out in front. We all have learned the challenges in resource management and decision making; we have learned about the limits of science and economics and challenges of using science. DFG has been pushed to think about how to integrate reserves in fishery management. The amount of information for Channel Islands is incredible. The process has stimulated thinking for reserve theory, design and application, public awareness and understanding. The process built long-lasting relationships that will see us through other processes. WE tested a new model for policy and decision making and how to do it – Matt Cahn’s article highlights the connection between science and policy. There is tremendous good will and a solid foundation for agency partnerships, which has enabled us to have a bigger role in the community. I thank MRWG members for their true leadership. I thank Sanctuary staff who provided amazing support to all aspects of the process, which enabled us to work productively. DFG have been helpful as have the facilitators. This process will serve us well. This is the first step and we will move this through some different groups and processes and reserves will be a part of future management and we will understand it intimately.

Matt – I see this as an absolute success, I would have been surprised had we reached consensus. FKNMS took ten years. The level of knowledge of the region and Sanctuary is tremendous and we each have earned a Ph.D. in politics.

CINMS demonstrated our commitment to have science based and community-based involvement and we took a hard look at economics. We are trying to do business at a community level and we have developed strong partnerships and friendships. I invite you all to please attend future SAC meetings and to remain involved as this process evolves.

Facilitators – Thanked the MRWG and panels and the public.

The Meeting adjourned and the MRWG concluded.